

### REMARKS

This Response is submitted in reply to the non-final Office Action dated June 9, 2008, issued in connection with the above-identified application. Claims 1-5 are all the claims pending in the present application. With this Response, no claims have been amended; and no new matter has been introduced. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Wakitani et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,414,657, hereafter "Wakitani").

The Applicants assert that Wakitani fails to disclose or suggest all the features recited in at least independent claim 1. Claim 1 recites, in relevant part, the following features:

"[a] method of testing and inspecting a plasma display panel...

wherein, the address pulse voltage is not applied to a target cell in a predetermined sub-field to be tested and inspected, but is applied to at least one specific cell of adjacent cells positioned adjacent to the target cell, and the address pulse voltage is applied to the target cell in a successive sub-field, and it is judged whether the target cell in the successive sub-field is on or not."

The features noted above in claim 1 are fully supported by the Applicants' disclosure (see e.g., Figures 4 and 6-8).

In the Office Action, the Examiner relies on Wakitani for disclosing all the features recited in claim 1. However, The Applicants maintain that the cited prior art fails to disclose or suggest at least an address pulse voltage not applied to a target cell in a predetermined sub-field to be tested and inspected but applied to at least one specific cell of adjacent cells, and an address pulse voltage applied to the target cell in a successive sub-field so that it can be judged whether the target cell in the successive sub-field is on or not, as recited in claim 1.

Wakitani discloses a display device driving for a gray scale expression in which at least a sub-field having the highest luminance value among plural sub-fields is further divided into a plurality of sub-field parts in order to obtain an image display having an accurate gray scale with no flicker noise (see e.g., abstract).

In the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that all the features of claim 1 are disclosed or suggested by Figs. 3, and col. 10, lines 26-50 of Wakitani. Col. 10, lines 26-50 describe in detail Fig. 3; and Fig. 3 of Wakitani discloses a table showing a concrete method attaining 256 gray scales. As shown in Fig. 3, the display screen having the 256 gray scales is obtained by combining the ON and OFF states of nine sub-fields (e.g., Sub5, Sub6, Sub8a, Sub7, Sub8b, Sub1,...and Sub4) in various patterns. The 256 gray scales are in the range from a first gray scale (luminance 0) caused by the OFF states of all sub-fields to the 256th gray scale (luminance  $255 \times B$ ) caused by the ON states of all sub-fields.

Thus, Fig. 3 of Wakitani merely discloses or suggests that the numbers in the two columns from the left side end show gray scales and the third to eleventh columns show which sub-fields are in ON or OFF states. Such a combination of ON and OFF states of sub-fields determines a gray scale of each cell of a plasma display panel (PDP) in a field including such sub-fields.

Based on the above discussion, the present invention (as recited in claim 1) differs from Wakitani for at least the reasons noted below.

First, the present invention (as recited claim 1) is directed to determining if a plasma display panel includes cells having a problem achieving display. This is determined by testing and inspecting whether a target cell has a sustain discharge or not in a sub-field in which a sustain discharge is to be performed. In contrast, Wakitani teaches a display device driving for gray scale expression in which at least a sub-field having the highest luminance value among plural sub-fields is further divided into a plurality of sub-field parts in order to obtain an image display having accurate gray scale with no flicker noise. Nowhere in Wakitani does it disclose or suggest detecting cells having a problem achieving display.

Second, Wakitani is completely silent with regard to adjacent cells positioned adjacent to the target cell, wherein the address pulse voltage is applied to the target cell in successive sub-fields, and it is judged whether the target cell in the successive sub-fields is on or not.

Based on the above discussion, claim 1 is not anticipated or rendered obvious by Wakitani. Likewise, claims 2-5 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Wakitani at least by

virtue of their dependency from independent claim 1.

Moreover, claims 2-5 are also believed to be distinguishable over Wakitani on their own merit. In the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that Fig. 3 and col. 10, lines 26-50 also disclose or suggest all the features of claims 2-5. However, col. 10, lines 26-50 described in detail Fig. 3; and Fig. 3 of Wakitani merely discloses a relationship between combinations of the ON and OFF states of sub-fields and gray scales. Wakitani is silent with regard to a relationship between cells of PDP, as similarly recited in claims 2-5.

Accordingly, claims 2-5 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Wakitani based on their own merit.

Based on the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that all the pending claims are patentable of the prior art of record. The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection presented in the outstanding Office Action and pass the application issue. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Tsuneo IKURA et al.

/Mark D. Pratt/

By 2008.09.04 15:27:21 -04'00'

Mark D. Pratt

Registration No. 45,794

Attorney for Applicants

MDP/ats  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
September 4, 2008